

1

## 2

3

4

5

6

(

)

9

O

1

2

1 Social Worker 2 classification. On May 7, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's  
2 determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. In summary, Appellant took exception to the  
3 Director's determination that the specialized case management and risk assessment responsibilities  
4 assigned to her position are described by the Social Worker 2 classification.

5  
6 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant asserts that social work has changed and that the  
7 Social Worker classifications do not accurately reflect the changing functions required by new laws  
8 and regulations. Appellant argues that she functions as the teen specialist for the Moses Lake CSO  
9 within the Economic and Medical Services unit, that she performs the specialized duties of her  
10 position for a unique population, and that she performs the duties of her position with very little  
11 supervision. Appellant contends that she spends a majority of her time working alone in remote  
12 locations which, for purposes of the allocation of her position, should be considered equivalent to  
13 being solely responsible for work in a remote office. Appellant asserts that the definition of the  
14 Social Worker 3 classification is narrowly written to address the work performed by individuals  
15 assigned to specific units of DSHS and that the work she performs within the Economic and  
16 Medical Services unit is comparable to the work performed by employees allocated to the Social  
17 Worker 3 classification in the Aging and Adult Services and the Children and Family Services  
18 units. Therefore, Appellant contends that her unique, specialized position in the Economic and  
19 Medical Services unit should be reallocated to Social Worker 3.

20  
21 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent acknowledges that as programs change,  
22 classifications may become outdated. However, Respondent asserts that the Personnel Appeals  
23 Board is not the proper entity to address outdated classifications. Respondent recognizes that  
24 Appellant is responsible for a large, unique case load and that her position is not specifically  
25 identified the Social Worker classifications. However, Respondent asserts that the majority of  
26 Appellant's duties involve conducting assessments for clients as described by the Social Worker 2

1 classification. Respondent further asserts that Appellant does not function as a lead worker and is  
2 not the sole person responsible for the full scope of services provided in a remote office. Therefore,  
3 Respondent contends that Appellant's position does not meet the definition or the distinguishing  
4 characteristics for the Social Worker 3 classification and that her position is properly allocated to  
5 the 2 level.

6  
7 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly  
8 allocated to the Social Worker 2 classification should be affirmed.

9  
10 **Relevant Classification.** Social Worker 2, class code 35210, and Social Worker 3, class code  
11 35220.

12  
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
15 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
16 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
17 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
18 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
19 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
20 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21  
22 Even if class specifications become outdated as functions of positions evolve, the Personnel  
23 Appeals Board is not the proper entity to rewrite class specifications. Sorenson v. Dep't of Social  
24 and Health Services, PAB No. A94-020 (1995).

25  
26 The definition of the Social Worker 3 classification states, in relevant part:

1 Within the Department of Social and Health Services, functions as a lead worker or  
2 sole case manager in a remote location in . . . Economic and Medical Services. . .  
3 . All positions at this level receive little supervision - employees are responsible for  
4 devising their own work methods.

5 Appellant performs her duties in the Economic and Medical Services unit. The Social Worker 3  
6 distinguishing characteristics require that in the Economic and Medical Services unit, incumbents  
7 either: (a) serve as the lead worker reporting to an off-site supervisor, or (b) are solely responsible  
8 for the full scope of social services in a remote office.

9  
10 Appellant is not a lead worker. Her office is located in the Moses Lake CSO. The Moses Lake  
11 CSO is not considered a remote location. Furthermore, Appellant is not solely responsible for the  
12 full scope of social services at the Moses Lake CSO. Therefore, her position is not comparable to  
13 those intended to be encompassed by the Social Worker 3 classification.

14  
15 The definition for the Social Worker 2 classification states, in relevant part, that incumbents provide  
16 “professional level social services to the clients of . . . Economic and Medical Services. Positions  
17 in this classification receive little supervision - employees are responsible for devising own work  
18 methods . . . .”

19  
20 The Social Worker 2 distinguishing characteristics require that in the Economic and Medical  
21 Services unit, incumbents “[p]rovide case management for clients with varying degrees of  
22 vocational, social, cultural, and/or medical impairments hindering economic independence. . . .  
23 Assess and determine employability, job readiness, and vocational education and training needs.  
24 Create, implement, monitor, and modify case plans for achieving client economic and social self-  
25 support. . . .”

Appellant provides professional level case management for teen parents. She accesses and determines varying degrees of risk and living needs for the teens assigned to her caseload, develops and implements individual responsibility plans (IRPs) and manages her caseload through completion of the IRPs. Appellant's duties and responsibilities are encompassed by the Social Worker 2 definition and distinguishing characteristics and are characteristic of the typical work statements for this classification.

**Conclusion.** Appellant's position is properly classified as a Social Worker 2, and her appeal should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated April 26, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

#### **ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Katherine Uhlinger is denied and the determination of the Director, dated April 26, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1999.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nathan S. Ford Jr., Member

Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504